

REMARKS

In a final Office Action dated September 7, 2005, the Examiner objected to claim 15 as failing to further limit the subject matter of claim 8. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lipp (U.S. Patent No. 5,398,022). The Examiner objected to claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-10, and 12-14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. The Examiner allowed claims 19 and 20. The rejections and objections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to claim 15 as failing to further limit the subject matter of claim 8, in particular noting that the limitation "the display screen" has already been recited in claim 8. The applicants have amended claim 8 to clarify the claim. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claim 15.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lipp. Specifically, with respect to claim 1, the Examiner contended that Lipp teaches a method for controlling an illumination of a display screen (50) in portable wireless communication device (5) including illuminating the display screen (50) (via a light source (60), FIG. 1), determining at least one illumination time parameter corresponding to a message displayed on the display screen, wherein the at least one illumination time parameter is based on a type of message to be displayed (col. 3, lines 10-19), and maintaining the illumination of the display screen for a period of time that is based on the at least one illumination time parameter (col. 3, lines 10-65). The applicants respectfully disagree.

Lipp merely teaches a user illumination of a display of a pager. The user flips a switch and the display lights up for a pre-set fixed period of time. That's all. Nowhere does Lipp teach any determining of an illumination time parameter corresponding to a message displayed on a display screen, wherein the at least one illumination time parameter is based on a type of message to be displayed, or an illuminating of the display

screen for a period of time that is based on a illumination time parameter that is so determined.

More specifically, Lipp teaches that a message is received and stored, and a display is then illuminated in response to a user actuating a switch. When the user depresses a key (thereby actuating the switch) for less than a predetermined period of time, preferably 1.5 seconds, the pager merely retrieves the stored message and displays the message on a display (50). When the user depresses the key for more than 1.5 seconds, the pager illuminates the display for a fixed time period (if the display is not already illuminated). (See column 3, lines 59-62, "the activation of light 60 is controlled exclusively by the pager user because this function is dependent on the time duration of switch activation.") The time period that the display is illuminated is fixed and is unrelated to the message being displayed. This is completely different from claim 1, which teaches a determination of an illumination time parameter based on at least one of a length of the message, a number of lines of the display screen required to display the message, and a type of message to be displayed.

While Lipp further teaches that the fixed time period may be set (for example, by the user) to one of multiple values, for example, a set of switches (45) allows the user to pre-set the fixed time period to any of 2, 4, 6, 8, or 12 seconds, again, this is just a pre-setting of the fixed time period. This does not equate to a determination of an illumination time parameter that is based on a type of message to be displayed. In column 3, lines 10-19, of Lipp cited by the Examiner, Lipp merely teaches is that a pager receives and decodes a message, which message, depending upon its length, may require one or more display segments. Nowhere does Lipp teach any determining of an illumination time parameter based on this decoding, let alone based on whether the decoded length of the message requires one or more display segments.

Therefore, Lipp does not teach the features of claim 1 of method for controlling an illumination of a display screen in portable wireless communication device including determining at least one illumination time parameter corresponding to a message displayed on the display screen, wherein the at least one illumination time parameter is based on at least one of a length of the message, a number of lines of the display screen

required to display the message, and a type of message to be displayed, and maintaining the illumination of the display screen for a period of time that is based on the at least one illumination time parameter. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 1 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 2-3 and 5-7 depend upon allowable claim 1, the applicants respectfully request that claims 2-3 and 5-7 may now be passed to allowance.

Claim 8 teaches a processor that determines at least one illumination time parameter corresponding to a message displayed on the display screen, wherein the at least one illumination time parameter is based on at least one of a length of the message, a number of lines of the display screen required to display the message, and a type of message to be displayed, and maintains a coupling of power to the light source for a period of time that is based on the at least one illumination time parameter. As noted above, such a processor is not taught by Lipp as the illumination time taught by Lipp is merely based on a user actuation of a switch and not on a message parameter. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 8 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 9-10 and 12-15 depend upon allowable claim 8, the applicants respectfully request that claims 9-10 and 12-15 may now be passed to allowance.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Tal Mor, et al.

By: 

Steven A. May

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 44,912

Phone No.: 847/576-3635

Fax No.: 847/576-3750